

September 27, 2005

Board of Supervisors
County of Ventura
800 South Victoria Avenue
Ventura, CA 93009

RECEIVED

SEP 26 2005

DIV. OF HOUSING
POLICY DEVELOPMENT HCD

SUBJECT: VENTURA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN 2005 ANNUAL REPORT

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Receive and file the attached 2005 Annual Report on the Status of the County General Plan.

FISCAL/MANDATES IMPACTS:

There is no fiscal impact associated with this report except for the report preparation costs that occur annually. State law requires the preparation and filing of an annual report on the status of the General Plan with the legislative body (your Board), the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, and the State Department of Housing and Community Development.

DISCUSSION:

The attached 2005 Annual Report provides a review of the General Plan Amendments that were addressed since January 1, 2004, and an overview of General Plan Amendments that are currently in process. In addition, as required by State law, a discussion regarding Ventura County's progress in fulfilling its share of the regional housing needs and local efforts to remove government constraints to the maintenance, improvement and development of housing is included. Furthermore, a discussion of new State laws and recent court decisions that may affect the General Plan and its implementation is included. Lastly, in accordance with a recent change in State law, the Report discusses the degree to which the Ventura County General Plan complies with the State General Plan Guidelines.

This report has been reviewed by the offices of the Chief Executive Officer, Auditor-Controller and County Counsel. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact Bruce Smith at (805) 654-2497.



Christopher Stephens
Planning Director

Exhibit "1": 2005 Annual Report

c: Governor's Office of Planning and Research
California Department of Housing and Community Development
Ventura County Planning Commission



2005 ANNUAL REPORT

VENTURA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

California Government Code Section 65400(b) requires an annual report on the status of the General Plan and progress in its implementation, including the progress in meeting its share of regional housing needs, be provided to the Board of Supervisors, the Office of Planning and Research and the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) on or before October 1st of each year.

This report is organized as follows:

- A. A review of the General Plan Amendments that occurred since the last Annual Report,
- B. A review of privately-initiated and County proposed General Plan Amendments and related Zoning Ordinance amendments that are currently in process or waiting to be processed,
- C. A review of Ventura County's progress in meeting the housing objectives of the General Plan,
- D. A review of local efforts concerning improvement and development of housing, and
- E. A review of new State laws and court decisions that may affect the General Plan and its implementation.
- F. A review of the County General Plan for degree of consistency with State General Plan Guidelines.

A. Recently Completed General Plan Amendments

Since January 1, 2004, three General Plan Amendments (GPAs) were approved by the Ventura County Board of Supervisors (Board). The GPAs are as follows:

- **GPA 04-1, Hazards Update (County initiated)**
On January 27, 2004, the Board approved a GPA request to update the Hazards Chapter and Hazards Appendix of the Ventura County General Plan. In addition, various maps were updated to reflect new geotechnical information and circumstances.
- **GPA 05-1, Lake Sherwood Area Plan (Privately initiated)**
On May 3, 2005, the Board approved a GPA request for a 198 acre area to re-designate and reconfigure various Area Plan land use designations northerly and southerly of the existing golf course and to increase the dwelling unit limits from 30 to 48 in the area known as Planning Unit 2.
- **GPA 05-2, Lake Sherwood Area Plan (Privately initiated)**

On July 12, 2005, the Board approved a GPA request to re-designate a 3.08± acre parcel from "UR-1" (Urban Residential, 1 dwelling unit per acre) to "UR-1-2" (1 – 2 dwelling units per acre), to allow a subdivision into five residential lots.

B. Pending General Plan and related Zoning Ordinance Amendments

The following summarizes the GPA's and related Zoning Ordinance amendments that are currently in process:

Privately Initiated Requests:

o Cabrillo Racquet Club (Saticoy)

This July 2001 screening-approved GPA request is for an eight acre site to re-designate the site's Saticoy Country Club Existing Community map from "Commercial" to "Residential" at 20,000 square feet per dwelling unit. Post-screening applications have not yet been filed by the applicant. (Estimated hearing date: none scheduled / Case Planner: not yet assigned).

o John Rieder (Piru)

This July 2001 screening-approved GPA request is for a five acre site to change the site's Area Plan designation from "Agriculture" to "Residential" at 12 dwellings per acre. (Estimated hearing date: Spring 2006 / Case Planner: Dennis Hawkins).

o Dana Levy (Piru)

This February, 2003 screening-approved GPA is to re-designate an 16.5 acre parcel from "Agricultural" to "Urban" and "R-15" (Residential – 10-15 dwelling units per acre), to allow subdivision into 103 single-family residential lots. (Estimated hearing date: Spring 2006 / Case Planner: Dennis Hawkins).

o James Finch (Piru)

This July, 2004 screening-approved GPA is to re-designate a 32.81± acre area from Agricultural to Urban, to allow for the construction of 185 dwelling units in a mix of single-family, duplex and multi-family development. The applicant has filed the GPA and Zone Change applications but has not yet filed the required tract map application. (Estimated hearing date: Spring 2006 / Case Planner: Dennis Hawkins).

o Rockwell Scientific (Lynn Ranch-Thousand Oaks Area)

This July, 2003 screening-approved GPA is to re-designate 18-20 acre portion of a 69± acre parcel from "I" (Industrial) to "UR-2" (Urban Residential, 1-2 dwelling units per acre), to allow subdivision into 23 single-family residential estate lots. The applicant has filed the required post-screening applications. (Estimated hearing date: none scheduled / Case Planner: Kim Rodriguez).

- **Dennis Nickerson (Channel Island Harbor Area)**

This July, 2003 screening-approved GPA is to re-designate two approximately 10,000 square foot parcels from "Commercial" to "Residential High" (6.1 to 36 dwelling units per acre), to allow construction of 10 to 16 apartments (25% of which would be for lower-income households). The applicant has not yet filed the required post-screening applications. (Estimated hearing date: none scheduled / Case Planner: not assigned).

- **Skylark Investments (Solromar Community-South Coast Area)**

This July, 2003 screening-approved GPA is to re-designate a portion of a 6.46± parcel from "Rural" (2 acre minimum) and "Commercial" to "Residential Low" (1-2 dwelling units per acre), to allow subdivision into four additional single-family residential lots. The applicant has filed the required post-screening applications. (Estimated hearing date: none scheduled / Case Planner: Keith Turner).

- **Colton Lee Communities (Santa Susana Knolls)**

This July, 2004 screening-approved GPA is to re-designate a 23.67± area from Existing Community - Rural Exclusive, RE-5 ac, RE-1 ac, and RE-20,000 sq ft to Existing Community - Residential Planned Development, RPD-11 du/ac, to allow the construction of a 150-250 unit apartment complex (25% of which would be for lower-income households). The Board approved the post-screening processing of a GPA for 8 du/ac, or the average density of the RE zoned portion of the Santa Susana Existing Community, whichever is less. The applicant has yet to file all of the required post-screening applications. (Estimated hearing date: none scheduled / Case Planner: not assigned).

- **Martin Gramckow (Ojai Valley Area)**

This February, 2005 screening-approved GPA is to re-designate an 11.01 acre portion of the lot's total 28.07 acres. The applicant requests that the parcel's Ojai Valley Area Plan designation for the 11.01 acres be changed from Open Space 40 acre minimum (OS-40) to Open Space 10 acre minimum (OS-10) and that the zoning be changed from OS-40ac to OS-10ac. The General Plan designation of Open Space will not be amended. The remaining 17.06 acres would retain OS-40ac zoning and the Ojai Valley Area Plan designation of OS-40. (Estimated hearing date: none scheduled / Case Planner: Tricia Maier).

County Initiated Proposals:

- **Focused General Plan Update (Countywide)**

This project is an update to selected sections within the *Goals, Policies and Programs* of the General Plan as well as the related General Plan Appendices. Sections that will be addressed include: land use forecasts, traffic and circulation, noise and public facilities and services. (Estimated hearing date: Fall 2005 / Project Planners: Carl Morehouse and Tricia Maier).

- **Allowing Creation of Substandard Parcels for Natural Resource Preservation Purposes (Countywide)**

This grant-funded program entails amending the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance to allow for the creation of substandard size parcels for acquisition by public agencies and private non-profit conservation entities for natural resource preservation purposes. (Estimated hearing date: Fall 2005 / Project Planner: Debbie Millais).

- **Piru Area Plan Update (Piru Community)**

This project is an update to the Piru Area Plan to re-designate approximately 62 acres north of Hwy 126, south of the citrus packing plant, east of Warring Wash, and west of the United Water District spreading grounds from "Agricultural" to as-yet-to-be determined residential and commercial land use designations. This update is in conjunction with the privately-initiated GPAs for Reider, Levy and Finch noted above. (Estimated hearing date: Spring 2006 / Project Planners: Dennis Hawkins and Chuck Anthony).

- **Biological Resources Mapping and Evaluation Program (Countywide)**

This grant-funded program entails updating portions of the Biological Resources section of the Resources Chapter and Appendix of the General Plan. (Estimated hearing date: Summer 2006 / Project Planners: Lorraine Rubin and Liz Chattin).

- **Natural Resource Conservation Overlay Zone for Open Space (Countywide)**

On July 27, 2004, at the request of Supervisor Parks, the Board directed the Planning Division, when staff resources become available, to initiate a Natural Resource Conservation Overlay Zone as part of the County General Plan and Coastal and Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinances in order to designate National and State Parks in Ventura County for natural resource protection and passive parkland uses. Timing of this project is dependent upon other project priorities and staff availability, and further direction from the Board. (Estimated hearing date: not scheduled / Project Planner: not yet assigned).

- **Oak Woodland Management Plan (Countywide)**

On November 9, 2004, the Board directed the Planning Division to prepare an Oak Woodland Management Plan for unincorporated Ventura County. Although the Oak Woodland Management Plan is specifically budgeted, timing of this project is dependent upon staff availability. (Estimated hearing date: not scheduled / Project Planner: not yet assigned).

- **Agricultural Buffer Standards (Countywide)**

On January 11, 2005, the Board, at the request of Supervisor Parks, directed the Planning Division, when staff resources become available, to analyze a proposed County ordinance amendment and prepare and process an amendment to the County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinances to establish agricultural buffering setbacks. Timing of this project is dependent upon other project priorities and staff availability. (Estimated hearing date: not scheduled / Project Planner: not yet assigned).

- **Jobs/Housing Linkage Fee (Countywide)**

On January 25, 2005, the Board directed staff to prepare a work program for Board consideration to amend General Plan policy 3.4.2-8 and the County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines to eliminate project-by-project assessment of the indirect housing impacts generated by new commercial/industrial uses and substitute a programmatic approach (i.e., jobs/housing linkage fee). (Estimated hearing date: not scheduled / Project Planner: Tricia Maier).

- **Wind Farms and Military Encroachment (adjacent to Pt. Mugu)**

On July 26, 2005, the Board, at the request of Supervisor Mikels, directed the Planning Division to study the Navy's "Red-Yellow-Green Strategy" for protecting military aviation facilities from encroachment by wind farms. The Planning Division was directed to research and study the matter and return to the Board for further review. Timing of this project is dependent upon other project priorities and staff availability. (Estimated hearing date: not scheduled / Project Planner: not yet assigned).

- **Update of the Density Bonus Provisions of the Zoning Ordinance – State Mandated (County-wide)**

On January 25, 2005, the Board postponed consideration of a program to update the Density Bonus provisions of the County Zoning Ordinance to be consistent with recent changes to State law, and directed staff to report back to the Board at such time as the State legislature considers cleanup legislation. At this time it appears that there will be no clean-up legislation this legislative session. (Estimated hearing date: not scheduled / Project Planner: Tricia Maier).

- **Housing Element Update – State Mandated (Countywide)**

State law requires cities and counties to periodically update the housing element of the local jurisdiction's general plan. The deadline for the next update for jurisdictions within the SCAG region is June 30, 2006. However, SCAG is not expected to begin the update of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) until Spring of 2006. The RHNA must be completed prior to completion of updates to city and county housing elements. The State Legislature is expected to consider a two-year time extension for housing elements within the SCAG region, and the Ventura County Planning Division is expected to begin coordination with SCAG on the RHNA process in the Spring of 2006 and begin the process of updating the County housing element in 2007. (Estimated hearing date: Spring 2008 / Project Planner: Tricia Maier).

- **Rezoning and Zoning Ordinance Amendments for Consistency with the General Plan – State Mandated (Countywide)**

State law requires that Zoning Ordinances be consistent with the general plan. Since the County's rezoning program in the mid-1980s, it has been discovered that several hundred parcels of land do not have zoning that is consistent with the County General Plan (e.g., Rocketdyne, North Half). In addition, there have been some significant changes to the General Plan over the last decade that has resulted in seeming inconsistencies in the zoning ordinances. For example, the

minimum parcel size for Rural designated land was increased from one acre to two acres; however, the RA (Rural Agricultural) and CR (Coastal Rural) zones still specify a one acre minimum. Similarly, the RE (Rural Exclusive) zone has a 10,000 square foot minimum and the CRE (Coastal Rural Exclusive) zone has a 20,000 square foot minimum. These differences have caused confusion. In addition, the pending focused General Plan Update (see above) includes a proposal to increase the minimum parcel size in the Open Space designation from 10 to 20 acres in area. If this proposal is approved, properties must be rezoned and the minimum parcel size requirements OS and COS zones amended to be consistent with the General Plan. (Estimated hearing date: not scheduled / Project Planner: not yet assigned).

- **Update to the Resources Chapter of the General Plan (Countywide)**

The SEIR for the focused update of the County General Plan (see above) illuminated the need to update many of the sections within the Resources Chapter and Appendix; some of which have not been updated since the early 1980's. Specifically, the Water Resources, Biological Resources, Farmland Resources and Scenic Resources sections are in need of updating. Although the Planning Division has received Federal and State grants to update the Biological Resources section (see above), update of the other sections have yet to be specifically funded and programmed for update. (Estimated hearing date: not scheduled / Project Planner: not yet assigned).

- **Area Plan Updates (Coastal, North Ventura Avenue, Saticoy, Thousand Oaks, Ahmanson Ranch, Ojai Valley, El Rio/Del Norte, Oak Park, Piru, Lake Sherwood/Hidden Valley).**

The County has adopted 10 Area Plans that specifically regulate land uses and discretionary development in specific geographical communities/areas within the unincorporated area of the County. Attachment 3 lists each of the Area Plans and the date of adoption or last major amendment. The Piru Area Plan is the only Area Plan that is being updated at the present time. Timing of updates to the other Area Plans is dependent upon other project priorities and staff availability.

- **Greenbelt Agreements**

The Board of Supervisors has directed that the existing Greenbelt Agreements be incorporated into ordinance format. In addition, Program 3.1.3 of the *Goals, Policies and Programs* of the General Plan states that the following additional greenbelt agreements should be considered by the County and appropriate cities for the following areas:

- Las Posas Valley
- Hidden Valley
- Upper Ojai
- Between Moorpark and Simi Valley north of Hwy 118.

Budget reductions in FY2004 effectively eliminated the planner position responsible for overseeing the greenbelt agreement program. Thus, the timing of this project is dependent upon other project priorities and staff availability.

C. Ventura County Housing Objectives Progress Report

Housing Objectives

The 2001 amendment to the Population and Housing Section of the County General Plan set forth the County's (unincorporated areas) housing objectives for a seven and one-half year planning period from January 1, 1998, to June 30, 2005. The housing objectives were assigned to the County by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) on May 2, 2000. These Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers are shown in the following table.

Table 1
Housing Objectives

Income Category	SCAG (RHNA) Housing Needs Assessment 1/98 - 6/05	% Of Needs By Income Category	Approximate Annual Housing Need
Upper	690 units	41%	92 units
Moderate	334 units	20%	45 units
Low	250 units	15%	33 units
Very Low	404 units	24%	54 units
Totals	1,678 units	100%	224 units

Source: SCAG – May 2, 2000

Ventura County's Progress in Achieving Housing Objectives

The following table illustrates the housing units that have been completed within the unincorporated area by income category between January 1, 1998 and January 1, 2004. The table also indicates the cumulative attainment of the RHNA numbers.

The assumptions and methodology for how the units were categorized is described in the Housing Affordability Assumption/Methodology Attachment.

Table 2
Dwelling Unit Completions and Attainment

Income Category Dwelling Units	SCAG's 7 1/2 Year Housing Needs Assessment Period							
	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	1st Half 2005
Upper DUs	59	72	56	72	148	87	105	
Moderate DUs	56	68	49	31	81	62	39	
Low DUs	76	45	47	43	69	86	126	
Very Low DUs	12	42	33	66	61	50	44	

	SCAG's 7 1/2 Year Housing Needs Assessment Period							
Income Category Dwelling Units	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	1st Half 2005
Annual Total DU Completions	203	227	185	212	359	285	314	
Cumulative Total DUs	203	430	615	827	1186	1471	1785	
Cumulative DUs Need	224	447	671	895	1,119	1,342	1,566	1,678
Cumulative Attainment	91%	96%	92%	92%	106%	110%	114%	

The following table shows the County's housing "need" (i.e., RHNA number of dwellings needed for each income category) versus number of dwelling units actually completed in unincorporated areas of the County from January 1, 1998, to December 31, 2004 (i.e., the first seven years of SCAG's RHNA seven and one half year cycle).

Table 3
Housing Attainment by Income Category

Income Category	Dwellings Needed 1/98 - 12/04	Dwellings Provided 1/98 - 12/04	% Of Needs Being Met
Upper	644	599	93%
Moderate	312	386	124%
Low	233	492	211%
Very Low	377	308	82%
Totals	1,566	1,785	114%

The following table illustrates the housing units completed in the unincorporated portion of the county in 2004 distributed by dwelling unit type:

Table 4
2004 Housing Completions by Dwelling Unit Type

Dwelling Unit Type	Amount	By %
Single-Family Dwellings	136	43%
Apartments	103	33%
Town homes/Condominiums	37	12%
Mobile Homes	32	10%
Second Dwelling Units	6	2%
Totals	314	100%

Of the 314 dwelling units completed in 2004, 44 percent were located on the California State University, Channel Islands campus (CSUCI), 10 percent were located in the Ojai Valley area, 8 percent were located in the Lake Sherwood area and 6 percent were located in the Thousand Oaks area. The remaining 32 percent was scattered throughout the unincorporated area of the County.

D. Local Assistance Efforts For Maintenance, Improvement And Development Of Housing

Every year, the County prepares a plan that identifies the unmet needs for affordable and supportive housing, community development programs, social service programs and economic development opportunities for low-income residents. The Consolidated Plan which covers the period 2005-2008, addresses the unincorporated area of the county and the cities of Fillmore, Moorpark, Port Hueneme, Ojai and Santa Paula. In addition, the Consolidated Plan must be approved by the Department of Housing and Urban Development in order for the County to receive a variety of Federal grants including the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), the Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG) and the HOME Investment Partnership Act (HOME) grant. The *Ventura County 2005-06 Annual Plan*, which outlines the programs to be implemented in the first year of the Consolidated Plan, was presented to the Board on May 10, 2005.

Housing Assistance Programs:

The County is involved in housing assistance programs for various needy groups. The following programs, projects and activities illustrate the County's effort to meet identified housing needs for the forthcoming fiscal year:

- Housing Preservation Program, home rehabilitation grants/loans (1 unit);
- Housing Preservation, Mobilehome Program;
- Corporation for Better Housing - Santa Paula, increase the availability of affordable rental housing (41 units);
- Plaza Amistad Apartments and Townhomes, increase the availability of affordable rental housing (5 units);
- Palm Gardens Apartments, rehabilitate the Palms complex for affordable rental housing (15 units);
- Winter Warming Shelter, Assist previously homeless persons with housing and/or services (450 persons);
- RAIN Operations, Assist previously homeless persons with housing and/or services (200 persons);
- HCA, Behavioral Health, Assist previously homeless persons with housing and/or services (100 persons);
- Project Understanding – Rent Assistance, Assist previously homeless persons with housing and/or services (200 households); and

- HSA, Homeless Services Program, Assist previously homeless persons with housing and/or services (250 persons).

Resource Management Agency Activities and Programs:

The County Resource Management Agency has been actively encouraging additional affordable housing in the unincorporated portion of the County through the use of processing assistance and Zoning Ordinance Amendments. These activities, current Zoning Ordinance topics and programs include:

- *Affordable/Elderly Housing Developments:* Article 16 of the County's Zoning Ordinance provides density bonuses and other incentives to encourage housing for lower income and elderly households. On January 25, 2005, the Board postponed consideration of a program to update the Density Bonus provisions of the County Zoning Ordinance to be consistent with recent changes to State law, and directed staff to report back to the Board at such time as the State legislature considers cleanup legislation. At this time it is unclear whether there will be any clean-up legislation this legislative session. This project could be tied to the update of the housing element of the General Plan (see section "B" above).
- *Mobilehome Park Closures:* The County of Ventura has adopted Article 17 of the County Zoning Ordinance to regulate mobilehome park closures. The County recognized that mobilehome parks offer affordable ownership housing to the citizens of Ventura County particularly to residents over the age of 62; many of whom are on fixed, limited incomes. Mobilehome parks are a relatively low intensity land use, and in growing urban areas, older parks are coming under economic pressure to redevelop to more profitable uses. In these urban areas throughout the County, vacant mobilehome park spaces are usually rare. Park residents evicted because of change of use of the park may be unable to find space in other parks, or cannot afford the move even if a space were available. For these reasons, it was deemed necessary to protect the owners of mobilehomes from unreasonable evictions and undue financial hardship from a mobilehome park closure, while at the same time recognizing the rights of the park owners to pursue changes in land use. Persons who own mobilehomes in parks being closed are eligible for relocation assistance and/or compensation for their homes.
- *County Mobilehome Park Rent Review Board:* Currently, in the unincorporated County, there is a mobilehome rent regulation program whereby the County Mobilehome Park Rent Review Board reviews, and votes on, requests for rental increases by mobilehome park owners. Requests for rent increases above "allowable" must be justified by the owners.

The Planning Division has administered this program on an ongoing basis in order to assure the continued affordability of the existing affordable housing stock, specifically mobilehomes. A separate annual report is prepared to assess the effectiveness of this program.

- *Condominium Conversions:* Article 19 of the County's Zoning Ordinance concerns condominium conversions, and now provides incentives for rental projects converted to moderate- and lower-income home ownership.
- *Farmworker Housing:* In 1995, the Zoning Ordinance was streamlined to allow farm worker housing that met certain criteria, to be ministerially approved over the counter. On an annual basis, the landowner (or permittee) is required to submit a standard Farm Worker Dwelling Declaration to verify that the persons residing in the farm worker dwellings are principally employed for farm work.

On September 27, 2001, staff began the implementation of a Farmworker Housing Study (General Plan program 3.3.3-5(14)), by convening a Farmworker Housing Study Committee comprised of members of the agricultural community, farm labor advocates and interested parties. The Committee: 1) conducted a farmworker housing survey that resulted in the return of 1,516 completed surveys; 2) prepared a crops analysis report; 3) prepared maps of suitable farmworker housing sites; and 4) proposed Zoning Ordinance amendments to reduce governmental impediments to the location of farmworker housing in the unincorporated County. The Farmworker Housing Study was presented to, and approved by, the County Board of Supervisors on August 6, 2002.

County Planning staff then processed amendments to the Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance in May 2003 to relax some development standards that were found to be impediments to providing more farmworker housing. Furthermore, Planning staff is proposing amendments to the County General Plan to further aid in the provision of this kind of housing. Those changes are anticipated to take place toward the end of 2005. Additionally, County staff is seeking federal, state and private grant monies to develop farmworker housing countywide.

From June 5, 2003 to December 31, 2004, the Planning Division issued Zone Clearances for 13 farmworker/animal caretaker dwelling units. In addition, from January 1, 2005 to August 12, 2005, Zone Clearances have been issued for 8 farmworker/animal caretaker dwelling units.

- *Second Dwelling Units:* Second dwelling units provide an important source of lower income rental housing. On June 19, 2001, in an effort to encourage the construction of second dwelling units, the Board of Supervisors directed staff to prepare revisions to the County Zoning Ordinance to allow greater ministerial approval of these housing units as well as to review the required development standards to ensure consistency with state law (General Plan program 3.3.3-5(13)).

In May 2003, the Board of Supervisors adopted revisions to the Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance for second dwelling units. The allowable size for second dwelling units was increased in most unincorporated areas, discretionary approval was changed from a lengthy planned development permit to ministerial "over-the-counter" approval in accordance with state law, and revisions were made to allow second dwelling units in more zoning districts. However, the use of second dwelling units in some areas of the County remains restricted to larger parcels due to groundwater quality and traffic reasons.

From June 19, 2003 to December 31, 2004, the Planning Division issued 138 Zone Clearances for second dwelling units. Of these, 29% occurred in the Ojai Valley area. In addition, from January 1, 2005 to August 12, 2005, 60 Zone Clearances for second dwelling units have been issued, with 23% of those occurring in the Ojai Valley area.

For the years 1995 to 2000, the County issued zone clearances for a total of 52 second dwelling units (approximately 10 per year). In contrast, during the last 26 months since the amendment to the Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance, 198 zone clearances for second dwelling units were issued (approximately 100 per year).

As noted earlier in this report, only 6 second dwelling units were actually completed in 2004. The reasons for low number of completed second dwelling units relative to zone clearances issued is not known at the present time and will require additional research. Possible reasons include: 1) applicants have yet to complete their construction plans and apply for building permits, 2) building permit issuance has been delayed because of plan check requirements (structural, utilities, etc), 3) construction has been delayed due to unavailability of contractors or materials, 4) applicant had to subsequently abandon their plan to construct a second dwelling unit for financial reasons.

- *Modification of County Zoning and Development Standards:* To promote housing opportunities by reducing development costs. Several zoning and development standards have been modified over the years:
 - The requirement for two garage parking spaces per dwelling unit has been amended to allow two covered spaces in lieu of a garage.
 - Second dwelling units now only require a single open parking space.
 - Mobile and manufactured homes are now allowed as a single-family residence in zones where single-family residences are allowed.
 - Affordable housing projects allow for reduced front yard setback from 20 feet to 15 feet.
- *Inclusionary Housing Policy:* In January 2005, County Planning Division staff presented inclusionary housing background information and policy options for unincorporated areas to the Board of Supervisors. The Board voted not to pursue a County-wide ordinance or policy at this time. However, the Board did direct that new residential development in Piru (see pending private and public General Plan Amendments above) would be held to the same inclusionary housing standards as projects within the Piru Redevelopment Agency area (15% of units for moderate/lower-income households, with half of these units for very low-income households).

Although the County does not have a formal Inclusionary Housing Policy, new residential projects that require a General Plan Amendment have been consistently required to provide a percentage of the units affordable to moderate and lower income households. Since 2001, this form of inclusionary housing has been provided either voluntarily by the developer or been required as a

condition of approval on all residential General Plan Amendments screenings. It's anticipated that this requirement will continue to be applied on a case-by-case basis to land entitlements that require legislative approval.

- *Jobs/Housing Linkage Fee*: County Planning Division staff is currently preparing a work program and analysis on a potential jobs/housing linkage fee that will be presented to the Board of Supervisors in FY 2005-06. Background information and policy options for unincorporated areas will be presented. If adopted by the County, such a fee would function similar to a mitigation fee and require significant employment generating uses to contribute to the provision of affordable housing for lower income households. One potential option to be explored is the establishment of a County Housing Trust Fund to maintain and disperse affordable housing funds.

California State University, Channel Islands:

Over the past three years, the California State University, Channel Islands campus (CSUCI) has completed two phases of housing units totaling 356 dwelling units (apartments, townhomes and SFD's). Of those units, 193 or 54% were classified for low and very low income households. CSUCI is currently constructing a third phase of units (130 apartments, 36 SFD's and 78 townhouse units) which are expected to be completed by the end of 2005.

E. Legislation/Court Decisions

The following is a summary of State legislation and advisory guidelines enacted in 2004, which may affect the County General Plan and its implementation:

- AB 1268, WIGGINS. LAND USE.

Existing law requires the legislative body of each county and city to adopt a comprehensive, long-term general plan for the physical development of the county or city, and of any land outside its boundaries that bears relation to its planning. The law requires the plan to include a specified land use element that designates the proposed general distribution and general location and extent of the uses of the land for housing, business, industry, open space, and other categories of public and private uses of land.

This bill authorizes the text and diagrams in the land use element that address the location and extent of land uses, and the zoning ordinances that implement these provisions, to express community intentions regarding urban form and design, as specified.

- AB 2158, LOWENTHAL. HOUSING ELEMENTS: REGIONAL HOUSING NEED.

Existing law requires each city, county, or city and county to prepare and adopt a general plan for its jurisdiction that contains certain mandatory elements, including a housing element. One part of the housing element is an assessment of housing needs and an inventory of resources and constraints relevant to meeting those needs. The assessment includes the locality's share of the region by the Department of Housing and Community Development. A city, county, or

city and county is required to submit a draft housing element or draft amendment to its housing element to the department for a determination of whether the draft complies with state law governing housing elements.

This bill revises the procedures for determining shares of the existing and projected regional housing need for cities, counties and sub regions at all income levels, as specified. By imposing additional duties upon local officials, this bill creates a state-mandated local program. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws affecting housing.

- o AB 2348, MULLIN. HOUSING ELEMENT: REGIONAL HOUSING NEED.

Existing law requires each city, county or city and county to prepare and adopt a general plan for its jurisdiction that contains certain mandatory elements, including a housing element. One part of the housing element is an assessment of housing needs and an inventory of land suitable for residential development in meeting a city's or county's share of the relationship of zoning facilities and services to these sites. A city, county, or city and county is required to submit a draft housing element or draft housing elements or draft amendment to its housing element to the Department of Housing and Community Development for a determination of whether the draft complies with state law governing housing elements.

This bill revises the criteria for the inventory of sites to require sites to be identified that can be developed for housing within the planning period to accommodate that portion of a city's or county's share of the regional housing need for all income levels, as specified. The bill expands the relocation assistance available to persons displaced by sites identified for substantial rehabilitation. By imposing additional duties upon local officials, this bill creates a state-mandated local program. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws affecting housing.

- o AB 3065, KEHOE. GENERAL PLAN: SAFETY ELEMENT.

The Planning and Zoning Law requires that a city or county general plan consist of several elements, including, among other things, land use, circulation, housing, open space, conservation, and safety elements, which are required to meet specified requirements. The safety element is for the protection of the community from unreasonable risks associated with, among other things, the effects of seismically induced surface rupture, ground shaking, ground failure, tsunami, seiche, dam failure, and wild land and urban fires.

This bill revises and recodifies the safety requirements for state responsibility areas and very high fire hazard severity zones. The bill requires that its provisions apply to both cities and counties and require, at least 90 days prior to the occurrence of specified actions by a city or county, that both the draft element or draft amendment to the safety element, and that an existing safety element pursuant to a specified schedule, be submitted to the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection and to local agencies that provide fire protection to territory in the city or county. By imposing new duties on local agencies, the bill creates a state-

mandated local program. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

- SB 699, SHER. LOCAL PLANNING AGENCIES, DUTIES.

The Planning and Zoning Law requires the planning agency, after a legislative body has adopted all or part of a general plan, to provide an annual report, on or before October 1 of each year, to the legislative body, the Office of Planning and Research, and the Department of Housing and Community Development on the status of the general plan and progress in meeting the community's share of regional housing needs. The report is required to be prepared through forms and definitions adopted by the Department of Housing and Community Development.

The bill requires the report to include the degree to which the approved general plan complies with specified guidelines for the preparation of the mandatory elements of the general plan and the date of the last revision to the general plan. By imposing new duties on planning agencies, the bill creates a state-mandated local program.

- SB 1462, KUEHL. MILITARY READINESS ACTIVITIES: SPECIAL USE AIRSPACE.

The Planning and Zoning Law requires the planning agency prior to action by a legislative body of a city or county to adopt or substantially amend a general plan, to refer the proposed action to specified entities, including, among other entities, any elementary, high school, or unified school district within the area covered by the proposed action and any areawide planning agency whose operations may be significantly affected by the proposed action, as determined by the planning agency.

The bill includes among those entities the branches of the United States Armed Forces when the proposed action lies within 1,000 feet of a military installation, within special use airspace, or beneath a low-level flight path and would require the Governor, on or before January 1, 2005, to develop processes to resolve conflicts between military, a local or state agency, and a project applicant when the proposed project may have the potential to affect military readiness activities. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

The following is a summary of court decisions in 2004 that may affect a County's General Plan:

- Federation of Hillside & Canyon Assns. v. City of Los Angeles (2004) 126 Cal.App.4th 1180.

Petitioners challenged the city's approval of a revised General Plan "Framework" and the city's findings and statement of overriding considerations under the California Environmental Quality Act in connection with that approval. The Framework sets forth the policies, objectives, and goals for the long-term growth of the city, but is separate from the other elements of the General Plan. The Framework included proposed operational and physical improvements to traffic systems and infrastructure, policies to encourage the use of public transit and reduce vehicle trips, and other measures to reduce traffic congestion and

improve accessibility, including a proposed Transportation Improvement Mitigation Plan (TIMP).

Petitioners contended (1) the Framework provides no means to ensure that transportation infrastructure will be adequate to accommodate future population growth, and that inadequacy renders the land use and circulation elements of the general plan inconsistent and non-correlative; (2) the city's finding that the TIMP and other measures to mitigate transportation impacts are infeasible due to the uncertainty of funding from sources other than the city amends the Framework in a manner that will have a different or more severe effect on the environment, so the city must revise and re-circulate the EIR; (3) the city failed to consider alternative measures to ensure that development and population growth will not overburden the city's transportation infrastructure, so there is no basis for the statement of overriding considerations; (4) the evidence does not support the city's findings concerning impacts on air quality, water resources, waste water, solid waste, open space, and utilities; and (5) the population and housing projections in the Framework and the EIR are based on outdated census data, so the evidence does not support the projections.

The city contended (1) Petitioners could have argued in the prior action that the general plan is internally inconsistent and non-correlative but failed to do so, so res judicata bars that contention in this action; (2) the city did not revise the Framework in a manner that will have a different or more severe effect on the environment, so it had no obligation to revise and re-circulate the EIR; (3) this court determined in the prior action that the city could adopt a statement of overriding circumstances on remand, and that determination is the law of the case, so Petitioners' challenge to the city's adoption of a statement of overriding considerations must fail; (4) the city's findings support the statement of overriding considerations; (5) the city had no obligation to consider additional mitigation measures, and collateral estoppel bars any challenge to the EIR; and (6) collateral estoppel bars Petitioners' challenges to policy statements in the EIR, challenges to the city's findings concerning impacts on water resources, waste water, solid waste, open space, and utilities, and the challenge to the data supporting the city's population and housing projections.

The court of appeal held: (1) a general plan's internal consistency and correlation requirements do not require a city to limit population growth or to provide traffic management measures to ensure that its transportation infrastructure can accommodate future population growth; (2) rather than requiring a city to either limit population growth or to provide measures to manage increased traffic, the circulation element of a general plan must provide meaningful proposals to address changes reflected in the land use element, and the land use element must provide meaningful proposals to reflect changes reflected in the circulation element; and (3) the city's finding that the proposed TIMP was infeasible was not a definitive statement that the funds will not be available and, since that finding is not itself part of the general plan, it cannot make the general plan internally inconsistent or non-correlative. The court also rejected petitioner's CEQA and other objections.

- *Save Our Sunol, Inc. v. Mission Valley Rock Co.* (2004) 124 Cal.App.4th 276.

The voters of Alameda County (County) adopted an initiative in November 2000 amending the County general plan's land uses chapter. The initiative, known as Measure D, was enacted to protect agriculture and open space. One addition required any new quarry located outside an urban zone to be approved by the voters. Measure D exempted from its application preexisting legal land uses and rights to development. At the time of the initiative's adoption, a quarry project located in the County's rural Sunol Valley had been under development for years, and the County had already issued a surface mining permit for the project. Following passage of Measure D, a Sunol Valley preservation group sued to enjoin the quarry project under Measure D. On cross-motions for summary judgment, the trial court found Measure D inapplicable because the Sunol Valley quarry project had already received County approval and was, therefore, not a new quarry subject to voter approval under Measure D. The court of appeal affirmed the judgment.

- *Native American Sacred Site & Environmental Protection Assn. v. City of San Juan Capistrano (Pueblo Serra)* (2004) 120 Cal.App.4th 961.

This case involved another general plan amendment by initiative and CEQA. Adoption of validly qualified, voter-sponsored initiatives are exempt from CEQA, as ministerial acts, as long as all material Elections Code procedures are followed. Here, Pueblo Serra circulated a petition to qualify an initiative to amend the general plan to change the designation of its two lots from "office research" and "planned community" to "Public and Institutional." After the initiative qualified for the ballot, the City negotiated an implementation agreement with Pueblo (to mitigate certain impacts) and then passed an ordinance adopting the initiative and the implementation agreement together. Plaintiffs challenged adoption of the ordinance, claiming the City could not take such action without complying with CEQA. After the trial court ruled for plaintiffs, the City set aside the ordinance, but simultaneously passed another ordinance adopting the initiative, exactly as presented in the original initiative petition, but without including any implementation agreement. Plaintiffs filed another CEQA action, seeking to set aside the second ordinance, and claiming the City could not adopt it without complying with CEQA, and that it was too late to claim adoption of the initiative was a ministerial act. The court of appeal disagreed, holding that even though it was adopted several months after first presented to the City, the tardy adoption of the initiative, without change, was still a ministerial act, and therefore not subject to CEQA review.

- *The Pocket Protectors v. City of Sacramento (Regis Homes of Northern Cal., Inc.)* (2004) 124 Cal.App.4th 903.

This case involved a specific and local area plan which contemplated approval of townhouses as part of a planned unit development within the specific location at issue. The appeals court held that the anticipated development (townhouses) was adopted by the City in part as an environmental mitigation measure for overall development in the area. The City later approved development of

detached, single family residences in the area, along with approval of a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project, but without preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) based on the changed development type. The plaintiff filed an action under CEQA, citing potential significant environmental impacts due to inconsistencies with land use policies and regulations previously adopted by the City, among other complaints. The trial court ruled for the City, but the court of appeal reversed, holding that development contrary to the area's specific plan could not be approved without preparation of an EIR where the plaintiff had submitted substantial evidence supporting a fair argument that the approved changes conflicted with the originally approved development for the area, including the local area plan's policies and goals, and, therefore, may have a significant impact on the environment. (Inconsistency with the general and specific plans themselves was not addressed in the case, other than in the court's finding that the conclusions in the City's Mitigated Negative Declaration that the project was consistent with such plans was "devoid of reasoning and evidence.")

- o *Sierra Club v. County of Napa (Beringer Wine Estates)* (2004) 121 Cal.App.4th 1490.

Napa County's specific plan provides that "[a]ll wetland and stream habitat shall be protected in their natural state, unless this is proved to be infeasible." In reviewing Napa County's decision that a winery project was consistent with its own general plan, the court of appeal held that even though the project was shown to impact wetlands protected by the plan, the county's finding of consistency was proper where the county had substantial evidence to support its finding that it was not feasible to protect those wetlands. The court held that specific plan allowed for such development in that circumstance and provided a rule for determination of whether protection of the wetlands in a project was or was not feasible. Sierra Club argued that the destruction of the wetlands rendered the project fatally inconsistent with the Specific Plan. But the court held that Sierra Club's reading was too narrow because it interpreted the term "infeasible" as meaning "impossible," suggesting that the Specific Plan required preservation of the wetlands "if it can be done, irrespective of difficulty or cost, and irrespective of whether the additional difficulty or cost will prevent the project from going forward." The court "found no basis in the wording of the Specific Plan itself, or in the law, justifying such a narrow reading of the term 'feasible.'" As the court of appeal stated:

First, Sierra Club's interpretation ignored the second part of the stated policy. If the term "feasible" means "possible," few projects would go forward that impact wetlands because it nearly always would be possible to protect the wetlands. By providing for mitigation compensation for impacted habitats, however, the plan clearly contemplates that development will occur even though it will have effects on streams and wetlands. Second, as noted above, general and specific plans attempt to balance a range of competing interests. It follows that it is nearly, if not absolutely, impossible for a project to be in perfect conformity with each and every policy set forth in the applicable plan. An agency, therefore, has the discretion to approve a plan even though the plan is not consistent with all of a specific plan's policies. It is enough that the proposed project will be compatible with the objectives, policies, general land uses and programs specified in the applicable plan.

- o *Defend the Bay v. City of Irvine* (Irvine Co.) (2004) 119 Cal.App.4th 1261.

Defend the Bay argued that a project was inconsistent with the city's General Plan due to an apparent conflict with two of its land use and housing provisions. At issue was the General Plan's Objective A-4, entitled "Balanced Land Uses: Manage growth to ensure balanced residential and nonresidential development throughout the City." The city concluded that "the project provides a balanced set of land uses that addresses the housing, employment, circulation and open space objectives of Land Use Element Objective A-4." However, the city also concluded that policies contained in the housing element of the General Plan were met, including Policy C-1(e), "Balanced Land Use," which includes this statement: "2000-2005 Objectives: Strive to improve the City's jobs-to-housing relationship, including matching type and price of housing to need generated by employment." The General Plan also had as Objective C-8: "Balanced Employment/Residential Growth: Provide a range of housing opportunities to allow persons working in Irvine to also reside in the City." Defend the Bay argued that there was an inconsistency because the project created more jobs than housing and therefore added to the City's housing shortage. Thus, it argued, there was "no balance between jobs and housing." The court of appeal held that this was "semantic manipulation. We are not dealing with assaying of minerals here. Balance does not require equivalence, but rather a weighing of pros and cons to achieve an acceptable mix. The general plan requires the City to 'strive to improve' the jobs-housing relationship. This project clearly does so. That Defend the Bay would strike a different balance than the City does not mean the project is inconsistent with the policies at issue." Thus, the court concluded that even though there might be such an imbalance, "There [was] no significant environmental impact that would require discussion in the EIR."

F. Consistency with State General Plan Guidelines

As stated above, Senate Bill 699 requires jurisdictions to include the degree to which the approved General Plan complies with the State of California *General Plan Guidelines*. Planning staff reviewed the State's *General Plan Guidelines* and determined that Ventura County's General Plan meets the mandatory requirements described therein. The *Guidelines* provide a definitive interpretation of State statutes and case law as they relate to planning. In addition, the *Guidelines* outline the general framework for preparation and revision of a General Plan, Attorney General Opinions, and the relationship of the General Plan to State CEQA requirements. Finally, the *Guidelines* describe elements that are mandatory for all General Plans (e.g., Housing Element, Land Use Element, Circulation Element, etc.). In general, however, the State's *Guidelines* are advisory rather than prescriptive, thus preserving opportunities for local jurisdictions to address contemporary planning topics in a locally appropriate manner.

Staff believes that the Ventura County General Plan is consistent with the requirements of the *Guidelines*. To illustrate this, Attachment 2 details the way in which the uniquely structured Ventura County General Plan integrates these mandatory elements into

various chapters and appendices. Attachment 3 lists adoption dates of the most recent revisions to various chapters of the General Plan and associated Area Plans.

Attachment 1 – Housing Affordability Assumptions/Methodology

Attachment 2 – Ventura County General Plan Compliance with State of California
General Plan Guidelines

Attachment 3 – Last Amendment Date of Ventura County General Plan and Area Plans

ATTACHMENT 1

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY ASSUMPTIONS/METHODOLOGY

(GENERAL PLAN 2005 ANNUAL REPORT)

In order to assess the County's progress in meeting housing needs, affordability characteristics of new units must be determined. Reporting affordability of new housing units is dependent on information regarding family income, number of bedrooms, and the sales price/construction cost or rental amount of newly constructed housing units. The following affordability characteristics apply to calendar year 2004:

Median Family Income

According to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, median family (four persons) income for Ventura County in FY 2004 was \$77,400. Utilizing the County median income, the gross income for the four income categories can be calculated. The results are as follows:

Table A

INCOME CATEGORY	ANNUAL INCOME	MONTHLY INCOME
Upper (120% of median)	Over \$92,880	Over \$7,740
Moderate (80% - 120%)	\$61,920 to \$92,880	\$5,160 to \$7,740
Low (50% - 80%)	\$38,700 to \$61,920	\$3,225 to \$5,160
Very Low (50% of median)	Up to \$38,700	Up to \$3,225

Maximum Affordable Housing Costs by Income Category

The following table indicates estimates of the ability of households to pay for housing based on 2004 income categories. The maximum affordable monthly housing payment assumes that up to 33%* of a household's gross income is devoted to rent or home loan payment. Maximum affordable unit cost is the maximum cost of a for-sale residential unit, assuming a 20%* down payment with 33%* maximum gross monthly income payment and a fixed 5.5 % APR** for a 30 year loan.

*Bank of America Affordability Guide Criteria: July, 1988

**2004 Ventura County Area Adjusted Average Annual Percentage Rate for Los Angeles, Riverside, Orange County Metropolitan Area per Federal Housing Finance Board

Table B

INCOME CATEGORY	MAXIMUM MONTHLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING PAYMENT	MAXIMUM AFFORDABLE FOR-SALE UNIT COST
Upper (120% of median)	Over \$2,580	Over \$568,000
Moderate (80% - 120%)	\$1,720 to \$2,580	\$378,650 to \$568,000
Low (50% - 80%)	\$1,075 to \$1,720	\$236,650 to \$378,650
Very Low (50% of median)	Up to \$1,075	Up to \$236,650

The maximum housing affordability may vary depending upon household size. Household size can be correlated with the number of bedrooms a dwelling has. The following assumptions are made with regard to the number of bedrooms and household size:

Table C

Number Of Bedrooms	Household Size
Studio/Single Room Occupancy	1 person
1 bedroom	2 persons
2 bedrooms	3 persons
3 bedrooms	4 persons*
4 bedrooms	5 persons
5 bedrooms	6 persons
6 bedrooms	7 persons

*Median family size

Based upon these assumptions, housing affordability ranges can be more precisely determined by target household size. The following table illustrates the estimated household income (2004), based upon family size:

Table D

INCOME CATEGORY	HOUSEHOLD INCOME BASED UPON NUMBER OF PERSONS IN FAMILY (IN 2004 DOLLARS)*							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Upper (120% of median)	Over 65,000	Over 74,300	Over 83,600	Over 92,900	Over 100,300	Over 107,750	Over 115,150	Over 122,600
Moderate (80% - 120%)	43,350 to 65,000	49,550 to 74,300	55,700 to 83,600	61,900 to 92,900	66,850 to 100,310	71,850 to 107,750	76,800 to 115,150	81,750 to 122,600
Low (50% - 80%)	27,100 to 43,350	30,950 to 49,550	34,850 to 55,700	38,700 to 61,900	41,800 to 66,850	44,900 to 71,850	48,000 to 76,800	51,100 to 81,750
Very Low (50% of median)	Under 27,100	Under 30,950	Under 34,850	Under 38,700	Under 41,800	Under 44,900	Under 48,000	Under 51,100

Source: FY 2004 HUD Income Limits Briefing Material, Family Size Adjustments.

*To the nearest \$50.00

Using the same methodology as above, the maximum rental payment and maximum housing unit cost can be calculated for each income category based upon the number of bedrooms in the housing unit.

Table E

INCOME CATEGORY	MAXIMUM MONTHLY HOUSING PAYMENT BASED UPON NUMBER OF BEDROOMS IN HOUSING UNIT (IN 2004 DOLLARS)						
	SINGLE ROOM OCCUPANCY	1 BDR.	2 BDRS.	3 BDRS.	4 BDRS.	5 BDRS.	6 BDRS.
Upper	Over 1,806	Over 2,064	Over 2,322	Over 2,580	Over 2,786	Over 2,993	Over 3,199
Moderate	1,204 to 1,806	1,376 to 2,064	1,548 to 2,322	1,720 to 2,580	1,858 to 2,786	1,995 to 2,993	2,133 to 3,199
Low	753 to 1,204	860 to 1,376	968 to 1,548	1,075 to 1,720	1,161 to 1,858	1,247 to 1,995	1,333 to 2,133
Very Low	Up to 753	Up to 860	Up to 968	Up to 1,075	Up to 1,161	Up to 1,247	Up to 1,333

Table F

INCOME CATEGORY	MAXIMUM HOUSING UNIT COST BASED UPON NUMBER OF BEDROOMS IN HOUSING UNIT (IN 2004 DOLLARS)*						
	SINGLE ROOM OCCUPANCY	1 BDR.	2 BDRS.	3 BDRS.	4 BDRS.	5 BDRS.	6 BDRS.
Upper	Over 376,550	Over 430,350	Over 484,150	Over 537,950	Over 581,000	Over 624,000	Over 667,050
Moderate	251,050 to 376,550	286,900 to 430,350	322,750 to 484,150	358,650 to 537,950	387,300 to 581,000	416,000 to 624,000	444,700 to 667,050
Low	156,900 to 251,050	179,300 to 286,900	201,750 to 322,750	224,150 to 358,650	242,100 to 387,300	260,000 to 416,000	277,950 to 444,700
Very Low	Up to 156,900	Up to 179,300	Up to 201,750	Up to 224,150	Up to 242,100	Up to 260,000	Up to 277,950

*To the nearest \$50.00

In order to complete the County's annual housing objectives progress report, staff collected appropriate data from the files of the County Assessor, the Building and Safety, and the Planning Division. In instances where complete or consistent information is not available, staff assigns affordability categories based on the size of the dwelling unit, parcel location and other known characteristics. For example, a dwelling unit between 1,500 and 2,000 square feet is assumed to have three bedrooms. Likewise, where Assessor's land valuation information is not available, the average value of surrounding parcels of like size is utilized.

Attachment 2

Ventura County General Plan Compliance with State of California General Plan Guidelines

State Requirements	Ventura County General Plan Chapters And Appendices			
	Resources	Hazards	Land Use	Public Facilities and Services
Land Use Element:				
Housing			X	
Business			X	
Industry			X	
Open Space	X	X	X	X
Agriculture	X		X	
Scenic Beauty	X			
Education				X
Public Buildings & Grounds				X
Solid & Liquid Wastes		X		X
Population Density/Building Intensity			X	
Flooding		X		X
Timberland Production	X		X	
Circulation Element:				
Major Thoroughfares				X
Transportation Routes				X
Terminals				X
Utilities				X
Housing Element			X	
Conservation Element:				
Water	X			X
Hydraulic Force		X		X
Forests	X			
Soils	X			
Rivers	X	X		X
Harbors				X
Fisheries	X			
Wildlife	X			
Minerals	X			
Open Space Element	X		X	
Noise Element		X		
Safety Element		X		X

Attachment 3

Last Amendment Date of Ventura County General Plan and Area Plans

Document Title	Date adopted or last amended
Countywide General Plan:	
Goals, Policies and Programs	01-27-04
Resources Appendix	09-19-00
Hazards Appendix	01-27-04
Land Use Appendix	06-19-01
Public Facilities and Services Appendix	03-26-02
Area Plans:	
Ahmanson Ranch Area Plan	12-15-92
Coastal Area Plan	11-20-01
El Rio/Del Norte Area Plan	12-10-96
Lake Sherwood/Hidden Valley Area Plan	05-14-02
North Ventura Avenue Area Plan	12-11-90
Oak Park Area Plan	12-10-96
Ojai Valley Area Plan	11-19-99
Piru Area Plan	10-23-01
Saticoy Area Plan	12-10-96
Thousand Oaks Area Plan	12-10-96

